

Photometric properties of Local Volume dwarf galaxies^{*}

M. E. Sharina^{1†}, I. D. Karachentsev¹, A. E. Dolphin², V. E. Karachentseva³,
R. Brent Tully⁴, G. M. Karataeva⁵, D. I. Makarov¹, L. N. Makarova¹,
S. Sakai⁶, E. J. Shaya⁷, E. Yu. Nikolaev⁸, A. N. Kuznetsov⁵

¹*Special Astrophysical Observatory, Russian Academy of Sciences, N.Arkhiz, KChR, 369167, Russia*

²*Steward Observatory, 933 N. Cherry Ave., Tucson, AZ 85721, USA*

³*Astronomical Observatory of Kiev University, Kiev 04053, Ukraine*

⁴*Institute for Astronomy, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA*

⁵*Astronomical Institute, St. Petersburg State University, Universitetskii pr. 28, St. Petersburg, 198504, Russia*

⁶*Division of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of California, at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1562, USA*

⁷*Astronomy Department, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20743, USA*

⁸*Department of Astronomy, Kazan State University, Kremlevskaya Street 18, 420008 Kazan, Russia*

Accepted —. Received —

ABSTRACT

We present surface photometry and metallicity measurements for 104 nearby dwarf galaxies imaged with the Advanced Camera for Surveys and Wide Field and Planetary Camera 2 aboard the Hubble Space Telescope. In addition, we carried out photometry for 26 galaxies of the sample and for Sextans B on images of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey. Our sample comprises dwarf spheroidal, irregular and transition type galaxies located within ~ 10 Mpc in the field and in nearby groups: M81, Centaurus A, Sculptor, and Canes Venatici I cloud. It is found that the early-type galaxies have on average higher metallicity at a given luminosity in comparison to the late-type objects. Dwarf galaxies with $M_B \geq -12 \div -13^m$ deviate toward larger scale lengths from the scale length – luminosity relation common for spiral galaxies, $h \propto L_B^{0.5}$. The following correlations between fundamental parameters of the galaxies are consistent with expectations if there is pronounced gas-loss through galactic winds: 1) between the luminosity of early-type dwarf galaxies and the mean metallicity of constituent red giant branch stars, $Z \sim L^{0.4}$, 2) between mean surface brightness within the $25^m/\square''$ isophote and the corresponding absolute magnitude in the V and I bands, $SB_{25} \sim 0.3M_{25}$, and 3) between the central surface brightness (or effective surface brightness) and integrated absolute magnitude of galaxies in the V and I bands, $SB_0 \sim 0.5M_L$, $SB_e \sim 0.5M_e$. The knowledge of basic photometric parameters for a large sample of dwarf galaxies is essential for a better understanding of their evolution.

Key words: galaxies: general – galaxies: fundamental parameters – galaxies: photometry – galaxies: structure – galaxies

1 INTRODUCTION

Environmental density has been argued to be one of the main factors influencing the evolution of galaxies. Our neighbourhood is predominantly populated by poor groups, made up of 1 – 2 massive galaxies and numerous dwarf satellites. A well-known morphology-density relation between the local density in groups and clusters and galaxy type (see

e.g. Hubble & Humason 1931, Einasto et al. 1974, Dressler 1980, Binggeli 1994) is also valid for Local Volume low-mass galaxies. The present day dwarf galaxies are supposed to be relics of building blocks that form larger galaxies during the hierarchical merging history of the Universe (White & Rees 1978). Such objects with typical masses $< 10^8 M_\odot$ lose gas easily due to their shallow potential wells. Thus, they are strongly influenced by the effects of morphological segregation. Dwarf galaxies are usually divided into two main morphological classes depending on their structure, age of stellar populations and gas content: early-type (dwarf spheroidal, dSph, and elliptical, dE), and late-type (irregular, dIrr, and blue compact galaxies, BCD) (Kormendy 1985,

^{*} Based on observations with the NASA/ESA Hubble Space Telescope, obtained at the Space Telescope Science Institute, which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy (AURA), Inc., under NASA contract NAS 5-26555.
[†] E-mail: sme@sao.ru (MES)

Figure 1. Distribution of our sample and the Local Group galaxies according to their projected distances from the nearest massive galaxy. The data were taken from Karachentsev et al. 2004. Roughly 50% dSphs are located within the projected radius of 300 kpc from the nearest massive galaxy.

Karachentseva et al. 1985, Grebel 1999). The majority of dSphs and dIrrs are low surface brightness (LSB) galaxies with $(SB)_{0,B} \geq 22.5 \div 23^m/\square''$, according to the definitions outlined by Impey and co-authors (Impey & Bothun 1997, Impey et al. 2001). The prototypes of dSphs are Sculptor and Fornax dSphs in the Local group (LG). There is no sharp difference between dEs and dSphs. However, dSphs are supposed to have on average lower surface brightnesses and surface brightness gradients than dEs (Karachentseva et al. 1985). The Large and Small Magellanic Clouds can serve as representatives of the brightest dIrrs. BCDs are systems dominated by very active star formation. A list of the LG dwarf galaxies and a detailed description of their properties can be found in a monograph by van den Bergh (2000) and a review by Mateo (1998).

The distinction between different morphological classes is slightly blurred. New observational data obtained at high spatial resolution and in different wavelength ranges reveal some peculiar properties of dwarf galaxies. For example, KDG61 in the M81 group classified as dSph (Karachentseva et al. 1985) contains a bright HII region and some bright blue stars (Johnson et al. 1997). Population gradients exist in the Local Group dSphs (Harbeck et al. 2001) and in the dwarf elliptical satellites of M31: NGC205, NGC185, NGC147 (see e.g. Davidge 2005, Sharina et al. 2006 and references therein). Since dIrrs and dSphs both have exponential surface brightness (SB) profiles, they are considered to be the members of a common evolutionary sequence. However, it should be noted that reliable and consistent SB measurements are complicated for faint galaxies. So-called transition type galaxies are probably faded dIrrs, depleted of gas.

In this paper we concentrate on the properties of dSphs and dIrrs. The LV dSphs typically are found within the distance of ~ 300 kpc around massive galaxies, while dIrrs are distributed more uniformly (see Fig. 1). They occur in groups of galaxies and in the field (see also Grebel et al. 2003, and Karachentsev et al. 2005).

Many physical mechanisms are employed to explain the evolution of low-mass galaxies: ram pressure stripping and stripping by the intergalactic medium, tidal interactions in groups and clusters, gas blowout through supernova driven wind, etc. (see e.g. Grebel et al. 2003, Boselli & Gavazzi 2006, Gunn & Gott 1972, Zasov & Karachentseva 1979, Gnedin 2003, Dekel & Silk 1987, Ferrara & Tolstoy, 2000). Low-mass disks are particularly sensitive to harassment by galaxy encounters and tidal interactions in high density environments.

Good data that constrain fundamental parameters for a representative sample of nearby dwarf galaxies would help toward understanding how galaxies are formed and evolve. The Hubble Space Telescope (HST) high resolution images represent the best material for stellar photometry, and detailed studies of the internal structure of galaxies. Accurate distances to ~ 200 objects in the LV were determined in four snapshot programs (Karachentsev et al. 2001; 2002a,

b, c; 2003a, b, c, d; 2006, 2007; hereafter: K01-07). These data provide us the means to study physical properties of a large sample of galaxies. A main aim of our study is to elucidate basic scaling relations between fundamental parameters of nearby LSB dwarf galaxies. The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we describe our approach to data reduction leading to the derivation of the metallicities and SB profiles. In Section 3 we discuss the resulting relations based on the derived fundamental parameters of dwarf galaxies: the metallicity – luminosity, the scale length – luminosity, and the SB – luminosity relations. In section 4 we formulate our conclusions.

2 DATA REDUCTION AND ANALYSIS

Our sample (see Table 1) consists of 104 dwarf galaxies observed with the Wide Field and Planetary Camera 2 (WFPC2) using the WF3-fix aperture (proposals GO 8192 and 8601), and with the Advanced Camera for Surveys (ACS) (proposals 9771 and 10235). All HST observations were carried out with the filters F606W and F814W, the response characteristics of which can be transformed to the filters V and I in the Johnson-Cousins system (see Holtzman et al. 1995, Sirianni et al. 2005 for more details). The exposure times were 600 seconds in each filter for the WFPC2 sample. The ACS images were taken with the exposure times of 900 and 1200 seconds in the F606W and F814W filters, respectively.

We select small galaxies, which are located almost entirely within the corresponding WF3 WFPC2 frames. Since the snapshot sample is restricted in the distance to galaxies, this selection criterion naturally leads to a limitation in the luminosity of the objects of study. About 70% our sample galaxies are fainter than $M_V \sim -15^m$ and have central SB in the B-band $(SB)_0 > 22.0^m/\square''$.

Stellar photometry and artificial star tests were performed using the HST PHOT and DOLPHOT packages (Dolphin 2000a). A detailed description of all reduction steps can be found in the corresponding manuals. Correction for charge transfer effects was made using the prescriptions described in Dolphin (2000b). Holtzman et al. (2006) tested different techniques of the point-spread function photometry and concluded that the photometry produced by the HST PHOT package is the most accurate to date. The authors describe the advantages of using the program, one the most important of which is a better quality of aperture corrections.

2.1 Determination of metallicity

To determine metallicity of red giant branch (RGB) stars in our sample dwarf galaxies we use stellar photometry results presented in a series of papers devoted to the investigation of the structure of the LV by Karachentsev and co-authors published between 2002 and 2007 (K01-07) and by Tully et al. (2006).

In these papers the distances were obtained with a typical accuracy better than 12% using the method of Da Costa & Armandroff (1990) and Lee et al. (1993) from the tip of first-ascent red giant branch stars. Metallicity of old stars was estimated for some galaxies from a mean color of the

RGB measured at an absolute magnitude $M_I = -3^m.5$ (Lee et al., 1993):

$$[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = 12.64 + 12.6 \cdot (V - I)_{-3.5} - 3.3 \cdot (V - I)_{-3.5}^2.$$

In this paper we extend the determination of metallicity in the same way to the larger sample of objects. The measured metallicities with the corresponding random and systematic errors are presented in Table 1. It should be noted, that the exposure times, spatial resolution, and the resulting photometric depth are different for ACS and WFPC2 images. So, the approaches to the data reduction were different for these datasets.

2.1.1 WFPC2

According to our selection criterion, only small galaxies, completely covered by the WFPC2 WF3 chip field of view were included in the analysis. This circumstance naturally leads to the limitation of surface brightness, since the sample of galaxies imaged in the snapshot programs with the WFPC2 is restricted in distance. Artificial star experiments show that a 50% stellar detection rate limit for LSB dwarf galaxies imaged with the WFPC2 at exposure times of 600 seconds in each filter is usually reached at $V \sim 26^m$ and $I \sim 25^m$. In Fig. 2 we demonstrate completeness and mean photometric errors for KK 27 and NGC 3741, which represent the most and least crowded images.

To study how the $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ uncertainties grow with distance, we use artificial star experiments¹ and the following procedure:

1. Selection of artificial stars with magnitudes and colors resembling those of RGB stars in the studied galaxies;
2. Choice of input magnitudes and colors for recovered stars corresponding to those of Galactic globular clusters: M15 ($[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = 2.17$ dex), M2 ($[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = -1.58$ dex), NGC1851 ($[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = -1.29$ dex), and 47 Tuc ($[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = -0.71$ dex) according to Lee et al. 1993;
3. Determination of the metallicity of the artificial RGBs using the method of Lee et al. (1993).

Note that we did not take into account luminosity functions. Artificial stars are evenly distributed according to their magnitudes. A scatter and a possible systematic difference between the color of an input RGB and that constructed by recovered stars was used to study $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ uncertainties. In Fig. 3 real and artificial color-magnitude diagrams (CMDs) are shown for one of the most distant and the nearest galaxies in our sample: KK27 ($I_{\text{RGB}} = 24.10$), and E294-010 ($I_{\text{RGB}} = 22.38$). In Fig. 5 we plot the difference between metallicities obtained using the observed and artificial CMDs versus the corresponding RGB tip magnitude for the galaxies imaged with the WFPC2. It is seen that the difference is not larger than 0.15 dex for galaxies located within 4.5 Mpc ($I_{\text{RGB}} \sim 24.2$ mag). So, only the galaxies within this distance range were selected for the proper determination of metallicity.

Fig. 4 (top) shows representative CMDs for metal-poor and metal-rich dwarf galaxies imaged with the WFPC2 (see also Karachentsev et al. 2002b). E325-011 and KK217

are dIrr and dSph satellites of N5128, respectively. Both galaxies are located at a distance of ~ 350 kpc from the center of the Centaurus A group (Catalog of Neighbouring Galaxies by Karachentsev et al. 2004, hereafter: CNG). E325-011 is a factor of twenty more luminous than KK217 ($\text{Log} L_B^{E325-011} = 7.8 L_\odot$, $\text{Log} L_B^{KK217} = 6.5 L_\odot$). However, it is a factor of ~ 7 less metal rich ($[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]^{E325-011} = -2.2$ dex, $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]^{KK217} = -1.2$ dex). The correspondence between luminosity and metallicity of dwarf galaxies of different morphological types will be discussed in Sec 3.1.

2.1.2 ACS

Completeness plots for the dwarf galaxies ESO 269-058 and KKs 55 represent typical most and least crowded fields imaged with the ACS (see also Karachentsev et al. 2007). These plots indicate that the 50% photometric detection limit on the ACS images is fainter than that of the WFPC2 images. To avoid possible systematic errors in determination of metallicity we select galaxies within ~ 6 Mpc ($I_{\text{RGB}} \sim 25^m$) for metallicity determination with the ACS.

In Fig. 4 (bottom) we show representative CMDs for metal-poor and metal-rich dwarf galaxies imaged with the ACS. High-resolution HST images for these objects were presented by Karachentsev et al. 2006, 2007. KKH6 is a very isolated metal-poor Irr in the outskirts of the Maffei group ($[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = -2.4$ dex). KK197 is an early-type satellite of NGC5128, situated very near to the center of the Centaurus A group. The CMD of KK197 shows a wide range of metallicities of RGB stars. Probably, this is an indication of unusual evolutionary history. The RGB is very populated, and the mean metallicity at the level $M_I = -3^m.5$ ($[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = -1.2$ dex) is determined with small random and systematic errors (Table 1). Both galaxies, KKH6 and KK197, have similar luminosities $L_B \sim 10^7 L_\odot$. Discussion about the relation between luminosity and metallicity of dwarf galaxies will be presented in Sec. 3.1.

The dispersions of RGB colors at $M_I = -3.5^m$ were measured for 30 galaxies observed with the ACS camera. The objects were chosen to be located roughly in the distance range $2.2 \div 5.6$ Mpc, so that the color spreads could be confidently detected. Selection of more distant galaxies leads to a situation where the dispersion of RGB colors is comparable with stellar photometry errors. Fluctuations of RGB color dispersions become prominent for nearer low-mass galaxies. RGBs appear to be insufficiently populated to measure the color spreads confidently. The color spread is defined as the square root of the difference between the observed color dispersion and the corresponding uncertainties of the color estimates taken in quadratures. The color measurement error is the sum of V and I measurement uncertainties added in quadrature and scaled according to the transformations from instrumental F606W, F814W to standard Johnson-Cousins system. Artificial star experiments allow us to estimate how crowding influences the uncertainties of stellar magnitudes. Our experiments for the least and the most crowded images show that the contribution from crowding is insignificant in the case of low surface brightness dwarf galaxies, i.e. less than 0.03^m . The resulting dispersions of RGB colors versus absolute M_{V_0} magnitudes of the galaxies from Table 1 are shown in Fig. 6. The RGB color spread

¹ Artificial RGBs are presented at anonymous ftp site: <ftp://ftp.sao.ru/pub/sme/DwGal/artRGBs/>

Figure 2. V completeness and photometric errors for the most and least crowded WFPC2 images (left: KK27, right: NGC3741). In the bottom panels, the line shows the mean output minus input magnitudes of artificial stars, and the error bars show the 1σ distribution.

Figure 3. Real and artificial color-magnitude diagrams (CMDs) for E294-010 (Dist= 1.92 Mpc) and KK27 (Dist= 3.98 Mpc) (see Section 2.1.1 for details).

for the giant elliptical galaxy NGC5128 (Rejkuba et al. 2004) is shown versus its absolute magnitude from HYPERLEDA (Paturel et al. 2003)². The dependence is almost linear, and RGB color spreads are larger for brighter galaxies. The dispersion of colors of RGB stars is influenced by age and metallicity effects. Detailed inspection of age and metallicity spreads is outside the scope of our paper. However, one may conclude from inspection of Fig. 6 that star formation events are more frequent and powerful in larger galaxies, and probably larger galaxies evolve faster. All these facts may be a consequence of the Schmidt star formation law (Schmidt 1959) in the sense that average gas densities are higher in larger galaxies. Our noteworthy case is KK197. This nearest dwarf spheroidal satellite of NGC5218 has twice as high a RGB color dispersion for its luminosity. This is probably a signature of a significant mass loss.

2.2 Surface photometry

2.2.1 Main recipe

Excellent spatial resolution of HST images allows us to reject background and foreground objects with high confidence and to obtain detailed data about the structure of inner parts of dwarf galaxies. The surface photometry was made using the SURFPHOT program in the MIDAS package developed by ESO. Major photometry steps were the same for all type of images, and identical to those used by Makarova (1999). The background on the cosmic ray cleaned images were determined by fitting a plane with the FIT/BACKGROUND program. One of the most important tasks is finding galactic centers. The centers were usually determined by the ellipse fitting routine FIT/ELL3. This procedure is complicated for some galaxies, because their irregular structure consists of multiple bright star-forming regions (for example, DDO53). In these cases the centers of symmetry were used for the subsequent integration of light within circular apertures. Bright foreground stars and background objects were removed from the frames before integrating the light. Elongated galaxies were processed using elliptical isophotes. The majority of our sample galaxies have regular elliptical isophotes and exponential SB profiles extending to $\sim 27 \div 28^m/\square''$ in the V-band. Some galaxies have complex structure with a central depression of light. Sometimes, bright star-forming regions twist SB profiles.

We fit the surface brightness profiles of all our sample dwarf galaxies by an exponential intensity law (de Vaucouleurs 1959) which implies a surface brightness distribution

$$\mu(r) = \mu_0 + 1.086 \cdot (r/h),$$

where μ_0 is the central surface brightness and h is the exponential scale length.

Our photometric results are presented at an anonymous ftp site³. Fundamental photometric properties of our sample objects are listed in Table 1.

Table 1 contains the following data: **(1)** Galaxy Name and morphological type (second line) from CNG in numerical code according to de Vaucouleurs et al. (1991), **(2)** equatorial coordinates (J2000) from CNG, **(3)** distance modulus (first line), and Galactic extinction in V-band from Schlegel et al. (1998), **(4)** mean metallicity of the RGBs, **and dispersion of RGB color, $\sigma(V-I)$, measured at $M_I = -3.5$ (first line)** with random and systematic errors of mean metallicity of the RGBs separated by a comma (second line), **(5)** projected major axis from CNG and limiting diameter of our photometry, **(6)** apparent V and I magnitudes integrated within the diameter D_{lim} , **(7)** limiting V and I surface brightnesses (SB) taken at the distance $D_{lim}/2$ from centers of galaxies, **(8)** effective $(V-I)$ color and effective SB in the V-band (superscript "a" indicates an average color), **(9)** mean SB within the isophote of $25^m/\square''$ in the V and I bands, **(10)** apparent V and I magnitudes integrated within the isophote level $25^m/\square''$. **(11)** projected major axis radius at the isophote level $25^m/\square''$ in the V and I bands **(12)** effective radius, and model exponential scale length, **(13)** best exponential fitting central SB in V and I bands and corresponding errors, Superscripts near the galaxy names indicate the corresponding name of the HST proposal: "1" refers to the proposals ID 9771 and 10235, "2" refers to the proposal ID 10210, and "3" refers to the proposals ID 8192 and 8601. Superscript "s" indicates, that SDSS images were used. The data listed in the columns (7)-(11), (14) were not corrected for Galactic extinction.

Representative SB profiles are shown in Fig. 7. In the following we specify the WFPC2 and ACS reduction steps.

2.2.2 WFPC2

Surface photometry of galaxies on the WFPC2 HST images was carried out using the recipes and transformations into the standard Johnson-Cousins system by Holtzman et al. (1995). All frames were corrected for distortion.

For our purpose we select galaxies with the CNG angular sizes less than the corresponding CCD images. In general, selection of small objects allows us to be sure that structural and photometric parameters are determined correctly. We list integrated magnitudes in Table 1 (column 6) only for galaxies located completely in their frames.

² <http://leda.univ-lyon1.fr>

³ <ftp://ftp.sao.ru/pub/sme/DwGal/ACSsbProfiles>,
<ftp://ftp.sao.ru/pub/sme/DwGal/WFPC2sbProfiles>,
<ftp://ftp.sao.ru/pub/sme/DwGal/SDSSsbProfiles>

Figure 4. Representative CMDs for metal-poor and metal-rich dwarf galaxies imaged with the WFPC2 (top): E325-011, and KK217; and the ACS (bottom): KKH6, and KK197 (see Sec.2.1.1 and Sec.2.1.2 for details). Empirical loci of the red giant branch for Galactic globular clusters M15, M2, NGC1851, and 47 Tuc (Lee et al. 1993) are overplotted.

Figure 5. Difference between metallicities obtained using the observed and artificial CMDs versus the corresponding I-band magnitudes of the RGB tip for our sample dwarf galaxies imaged with the WFPC2.

2.2.3 ACS

We employ the ACS images processed with the Dither package⁴. To transform our ACS surface photometry results into the standard Johnson-Cousins system we use the zeropoints and calibration coefficients from Sirianni et al. (2005). The 50 pixel inter-chip gap represents a difficulty for the ACS data analysis, because it often projects onto the central parts of galaxies. To solve the problem, we interpolate the image intensities within the gap. Towards this aim we extract parallel strips from the image area contiguous with the strip and insert them into the gap area. To test the influence of the inter-chip gap on the derived SB profiles, we compare our results with the literature data, and with our WFPC2 photometry results available for some galaxies. Additionally, we carried out surface photometry of our sample objects on the Sloan Digital Survey (SDSS). We found SDSS images for 22 galaxies from the ACS and WFPC2 samples. The comparison of our ACS surface photometry results with those presented in the literature and obtained by us using the WFPC2 and SDSS images shows that the fundamental parameters obtained by us using different types of images are trustworthy (see Fig. 8).

2.2.4 SDSS

Large scale, well-calibrated, deep SDSS images provide an excellent homogeneous material for high-quality photometry. Surface photometry was made following the steps described in Section 2.2.1. To transform our measurements into the standard Johnson-Cousins system, the empirical color transformations by Jordi et al. (2006) were employed. Extinction coefficients, airmasses, exposure times, and other important data were taken for each galaxy from the corresponding field table entries.

In Fig. 8 the comparison of the fundamental photometric parameters derived using the ACS, WFPC2, and SDSS images is demonstrated. It is seen, that the typical accuracies of the V and I magnitudes integrated within the limiting diameter D_{lim} (Table 1) and isophote $25^m/\square''$, mean SBs within the isophote $25^m/\square''$, effective SBs, and $(V - I)$ color are typically $\leq 0^m.2$. Exponential scale lengths and effective radii are obtained with typical uncertainties of about $2''$ for small galaxies ($R_e \leq 30''$). For larger galaxies uncertainties of this model parameters can reach $\sim 30\%$. There are no systematical trends in estimation of the aforementioned photometric parameters. We list apparent magnitudes integrated within the limiting diameter D_{lim} in Table 1 (column 6) only if the limiting diameter of our photometry is greater or equal than the major axis of a galaxy from CNG. However, it would be incorrect to interpret these magnitudes as

total magnitudes. For many our sample galaxies a ratio between a limiting radius from a center of a galaxy to a disk scale length is less than two. This means that if we assume exponential surface brightness profiles for our sample galaxies, the difference between the corresponding extrapolated total magnitude and an isophot limited magnitude may be greater than 0.5^m according to an equation (7) from Tully et al. (1996): $\delta m = 2.5 \log [1 - (1 + r/h)e^{-r/h}]$, where r is a limiting radius of surface photometry, and h is an exponential scale length.

In Table 2 we present fundamental parameters for our HST-based sample of dwarf galaxies imaged with the SDSS. Additionally, we include in this table the data for the nearby dwarf irregular galaxy Sextans B. Successive columns contain the following data: (1) Galaxy Name. (2) equatorial coordinates (J2000), (3) projected major axis from CNG and limiting diameter of our photometry, (4) apparent B and R magnitudes integrated within the limiting diameter, (5) limiting B and R surface brightnesses (SB) taken at the distance $D_{lim}/2$ from center of galaxy, (6) effective $(B - R)$ color and effective SB in the R-band, (7) mean SB within the isophote of $25^m/\square''$ in the B and R bands, (8) apparent B and R magnitudes integrated within the isophote level $25^m/\square''$, (9) projected major axis at the isophote level $25^m/\square''$ in the B and R bands, (10) effective radius and model exponential scale length, (11) central SB in B and R bands and corresponding errors. The data were not corrected for Galactic extinction.

2.2.5 The surface photometry errors

The magnitude errors are usually divided into internal and external components. We derived external photometric errors by the comparison of our measurements with the literature data and by the cross-comparison of photometric parameters obtained using different types of images. It was shown in the previous section (see also Fig. 8) that the measured magnitudes agree with the independently estimated ones typically within $0^m.2$.

Internal components consist of random and systematical errors. Random uncertainties are mainly defined by the accuracy of the background estimates. The standard deviation of surface brightness in photons per unit area is $\sqrt{g \cdot I + r^2}$, where I is the total object and background flux in ADU (analog-to-digital-units) in this area, g is the gain in electrons per ADU, and r is readout noise in electrons.

The systematic component includes the errors of transformations into the standard system and uncertainties of internal extinction estimation. The uncertainty of the WFPC2 photometric zero point is estimated to be within $0^m.05$ (Dolphin 2000b). The errors of empirical coefficients for the transformations from WFC to BVRI do not exceed 0.08 for the filter F606W and 0.02 for F814W (Sirianni et al., 2005).

⁴ <http://www.stsci.edu/hst/acs/proposing/dither>

Figure 6. Dispersion of RGB color measured at $M_I = -3.5$ versus absolute magnitude in the V-band (column 6, Table 1) for dSphs (dots) and dIrrs (open circles).

Figure 7. Representative surface brightness profiles for dwarf galaxies KK65 and UGC4115, obtained using three types of images: WFPC2, ACS, and SDSS. Internal photometric errors are overplotted.

Given the similarity of our sample dSphs and dIrrs to the LG galaxies we estimate that the correction for the internal reddening is $E_{(B-V)} \lesssim 0.1$ James et al. (2005).

Summing up the internal errors, we obtain the resulting errors of the integrated magnitude and the surface brightness estimations to be consistent with the external errors derived by the comparison of different measurements.

3 RESULTS

3.1 The luminosity – metallicity relation

In the top panel of Fig. 9 we show the dependence between B-band luminosities from CNG and metallicities of RGB stars for our sample galaxies. In the next two panels of Fig. 9 the same metallicities are plotted versus luminosities in the V and I bands obtained in our study. The errors of metallicity estimations are presented in Table 1, the photometry uncertainties are discussed in Section 2.2.5.

It has been shown by many authors that the more luminous dwarf galaxies are on average the most metal rich (Mateo 1998, and references therein; van den Bergh 1999; Grebel et al. 2003). The luminosity – metallicity ($Z - L$) dependency for the Local Group dwarf galaxies have been quantified by Dekel & Silk (1986). Caldwell et al. (1992) confirmed this relation using Mg_2 spectral line index for metallicity estimation, and showed that the $Z - L$ dependency obtained using this method is steeper ($Z \sim L^{0.6}$) for more luminous E galaxies. Thomas et al. (2003) found a unified relation $[Z/H] = -3.6 - 0.19M_B$ for early type dwarf galaxies and for giant ellipticals. Grebel et al. (2003) stressed attention to the fact that the LG dSphs have a higher mean metallicity of old stellar populations for a fixed optical luminosity in comparison with dIrrs. Fig. 9 shows that a similar tendency holds for our sample of galaxies situated in the nearby groups and in the field.

There may be several reasons for the separation between dIrr and dSph in the Fig. 9 metallicity–luminosity plots (see also Grebel et al. 2003 and references therein). First, perhaps the displacement being interpreted as a metallicity effect is actually an age effect. The average metallicity derived by the method of Lee et al., 1993 is only valid for stellar populations with the ages comparable to that of Galactic globular clusters. The age-metallicity degeneracy problem has been discussed for a long time (Worthey 1994, Saviane et al. 2000, Dolphin et al. 2003, Salaris & Girardi 2005, see also Zasov & Sil’chenko 1983). Fig. 5 from the paper by Dolphin et al. (2003) provides an exhaustive explanation of this effect. Probably, average ages of old stars in dIrrs differ from galaxy to galaxy and are systematically less than those in dSphs. The $Z - L$ relation for normal and dwarf elliptical galaxies can also be skewed by the presence of a significant intermediate-age component. However, this effect in dSph is not so pronounced as in the case of dwarf irregular galaxies.

A second explanation for what is being seen in Fig. 9 may lie in the influence of environments on the evolution of dwarf galaxies. The metallicity of interstellar gas is dependent on three factors: the rate of star formation, the degree of gas expulsion, and the influx of new gas. It was shown by Shaya & Tully (1984) that intergalactic material will not fall into a galaxy once it is in a group. Galaxies in isolation can continue to accrete fresh shells of low-metallicity intergalactic gas. However, the cluster potential creates a Roche limit around an individual galaxy. Gas envelopes lost by galaxies from violent star forming events are tidally stripped and acquired by the group or cluster. Shells of pristine interstellar gas that can fall into an isolated dIrr and dilute its metal content are prevented from falling into a dSph in the larger potential well of a group or cluster.

A third possibility is that the displacement between dIrr and dSph in Fig. 9 is partially in luminosity. Passive evolution of dIrr galaxies leads to a fading of $\sim 2^m$ of their integrated magnitude if they stop forming stars (Hunter & Gallagher 1985). Tidal mass loss by dwarf galaxies located near the centers of groups and clusters should not be ignored. Low density galaxies entering a cluster may get completely disrupted by tidal shocks over a time scale less than the Hubble time (e.g. Merritt 1984, Moore et al. 1999, Mayer et al. 2001, Gnedin 2003, Koposov et al. 2007, McConnachie et al. 2007). However, it is difficult to accept that disruption and fading alone explains the observed offset. The displacement of one to two orders of magnitude in luminosity implies a loss of 90% to 99% of light for essentially all early-type dwarfs. An ingredient might be added if similar physical mechanisms worked at the stage of dSphs formation. The difference in metallicity at the same luminosity between dSph and dIrr may, at least partially be due to the earlier, faster transformation of gas into stars in a denser environment (Hogg et al. 2003, Thomas et al. 2005) and a subsequent fading after the exhaustion of gas and loss of stars.

Five dwarf galaxies classified as dSphs have low metallicity values at a given luminosity that resemble those of dIrrs (Fig. 9): NGC5237, KKs55, CenN, KK189, and KK27. They either have a significant intermediate-age component, or have a gas recycling history similar to that of dIrrs, perhaps because they are in transition from the dIrr to the dSph state.

Several contradictory observational and theoretical studies regarding the existence of a correlation between luminosity and metallicity of young stellar populations in dIrrs have been presented in the literature. Note, that $[O/H]$ abundance is often used as the indication of the metallicity of dIrrs. For instance, McGaugh 1994, Richer & McCall (1995), Hidalgo-Gamez et al. (2003) found a weak relationship with luminosity. Other authors (e.g. van Zee et al. 1997, Skillman et al. 1989) established a strong correlation. Saviane et al. (2005) interpreted the existence of near-infrared $Z - L$ relation for dIrrs following the considerations by Skillman et

Figure 8. Comparison of properties of dwarf galaxies obtained by us using the HST images with the corresponding data from the literature (circles) and our photometry on the SDSS images (see Table) ("s" – signs). Small symbols refer to the WFPC2 data, whereas the larger ones represent the ACS data. Star-like symbols indicate cross-check between our results coming from the WFPC2 and ACS images. In this case the ACS data are shown along the X axis. The panels show the following data obtained using the images in the V and I bands: integrated magnitudes, and colors (panels 1-3), effective radii, and SBs (panels 4-7), model exponential scale lengths and central SBs (panels 8-11), mean SBs measured within the isophote of $25^m/\square''$, the corresponding V-band radii, and integrated magnitudes (panels 12-16). All magnitudes and SBs were corrected for Galactic extinction (Schlegel et al. 1998).

Figure 9. Luminosities of dwarf galaxies versus mean metallicities of their RGB stars. $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ was estimated from the mean color of the RGB measured at an absolute magnitude $M_I = -3.5$ (Lee et al. 1993). The data for the LG dwarf galaxies were taken from Grebel et al. (2003). The data shown for our sample galaxies are listed in Table 1 (Col. 4, 6), while luminosities in the B-band were taken from CNG.

al. (2003) and Pilugin & Ferrini (2000). In the evolutionary closed-box scenario the gas fraction decreases monotonically as metal abundance increases. Larger galaxies evolve faster. On the other hand, Hidalgo-Gomez et al. (2003) showed that the relationship between the metal content of a galaxy and its mass fraction of gas is not always linear. Those authors concluded that variations in the stellar mass-to-light ratio can contribute significantly to the scatter in the $Z - L$ relation.

According to the model of Dekel & Silk (1986), the formation of small, diffuse, metal-poor galaxies is mainly regulated by supernova-driven winds. Galaxies with the virial velocity and mass below a critical value undergo substantial gas loss as a result of a violent burst of star formation. Luminosity is proportional to metallicity as $L \sim Z^{2.5}$ in this scenario. One can see that our dependency for early-type dwarf galaxies lies close to the theoretical one. This result suggests that the efficiency of star formation is regulated by similar mechanisms in early-type dwarf galaxies of different luminosities. It increases with increasing mass and potential well of the object. Smaller galaxies lose larger gas fractions through galactic winds.

3.2 The surface brightness – luminosity relation

The relation between the mean SB of galaxies within the isophote level of $25^m/\square''$ corrected for Galactic extinction using maps by Schlegel et al. (1998), and the corresponding absolute magnitude integrated within the same isophote is shown in Fig. 10 (top). The slope of the dependency is well defined: $SB_{V25} \sim 0.33M_{25}$. Data drawn from the CNG give the correlation between a mean SB and an absolute magnitude in the B-band, $SB_B \sim 1/3M_B$, for all neighbouring galaxies and imply a constancy of galactic spatial density averaged within this isophote. In other words, $L \sim R_{25}^3$, where R_{25} is the radius of the galaxy within the isophote level $25^m/\square''$. Our study shows that this conclusion is valid for SBs and luminosities measured in the V and I bands. These findings imply that the mean luminosity density within ~ 10 Mpc is only weakly dependent on the mass of a galaxy and its environment.

In distinction to the average SB, the central SB shows a steeper dependence on the integrated luminosity (Table 1, column 6): $SB_0 \sim 0.5M_L$ (see Fig. 10, medium panel). This correlation is consistent with the luminosity – radius relationship, $L \sim R^4$, valid for the LG dwarf galaxies (Dekel & Silk 1986). It can be explained by a gas outflow model, first proposed by Larson (1974). Vader (1986) and Dekel &

Silk (1986) applied it to dwarf galaxies. A small galaxy loses an increased fraction of its mass through stellar winds. This reinforces the decrease of its gravitational potential and, as a consequence, of the central surface mass density.

The mean SB inside the circular aperture enclosing one-half the total flux seems to be sensitive to the mass lost in the same way. The slope of the "effective SB – effective absolute magnitude" relation (Fig. 10, bottom) coincides with the previous one: $SB_{V_e} \sim 0.5M_e$.

The scatter in surface brightness at a given luminosity can be not only the result of photometric errors and approximation uncertainties, but also may be influenced by physical processes. For example, surface brightness can depend on angular momentum (Dalcanton et al. 1997).

3.3 The scale length – luminosity relation

Fig. 11 shows the exponential scale length – luminosity relation ($h - L$) for our sample objects and for some brighter spiral galaxies. We use the integrated magnitudes from the column 6 of Table 1 for calculation of the luminosities of dwarf galaxies in the I-band. It is seen that scale length is proportional to luminosity as $h \sim L^{0.5}$ in the B and I bands for spiral galaxies brighter than $M_B \sim -12 \div -13^m$. It is known since a pioneering work of Freeman (1970) that the central surface brightness of spiral galaxies has a characteristic value, which means that the total luminosity of the disk is $L_T = 2\pi I_0 h^2 \propto h^2$, where I_0 is the central brightness. It is still under debate whether this result is common for all disk galaxies (see e.g. O'Neil & Bothun, 2000). The slope of the $h - L$ relation is identical for our sample galaxies with absolute blue magnitudes falling in the range of $M_B \sim -16 \div -13$ and for the spiral galaxies from the samples of Vennik et al. (1996), Binggeli & Cameron (1993), and van der Kruit (1987). However, fainter objects deviate from this dependency towards larger scale lengths. The different slope of the $h - L$ dependency for faint and bright galaxies is caused by a prominent central surface brightness – luminosity dependency for dwarf galaxies shown above. Passing from bright to faint, luminosities at first decrease with $I_0 \sim \text{constant}$ because h decreases, then continue to decrease because I_0 decreases with h only weakly decreasing. The change in the slope of the $h - L$ relation is presumably caused by the fact that galaxies with masses below some transition mass lose their gas more efficiently. It was shown theoretically by Mac Low & Ferrara 1999, Ferrara & Tolstoy 2000, Marcolini et al. 2006, and Read et al. 2006 that this limit corresponds to a critical mass $M_{crit} \sim 10^8 M_\odot$ in the

Figure 9. continued.

Figure 10. Surface brightness – luminosity relation in the V and I bands for our sample of dwarf galaxies: **top:** between mean SBs within the isophote of $25^m/\square''$ and the corresponding absolute magnitudes; **medium:** between central SBs and the absolute magnitudes integrated within the diameters D_{lim} (column 6 of Table 1); **bottom:** between effective SBs and the corresponding absolute magnitudes. All data were corrected for Galactic extinction using Schlegel et al. (1998) maps. The top and bottom right plots translate to stellar mass from the I band. The M/L ratios were estimated using $(V - I)_0$ colors of the galaxies integrated within the effective radius and the isophote $25^m/\square''$ (Table 1), Bruzual & Charlot (2003) SSP models, and a Salpeter IMF (Bell & de Jong, 2001). The symbols are the same as in Fig. 9.

case of mass-loss through stellar winds. This limit roughly corresponds $M_B \sim -12 \div -13^m$ (Bell & de Jong, 2005).

We have no means to quantify the weak $h - L$ dependency for faint galaxies. First, our data are not sufficiently numerous. Second, sizes and luminosities of dwarf galaxies may vary with the environmental density. Gnedin (2003) used high-resolution cosmological simulations to explore tidal heating of high and low-mass disks in clusters. He found that the possibility that a galaxy entering a cluster will be completely disrupted by tidal shocks depends on interplay between surface brightness of the object and its scale length in the sense that more compact and luminous galaxies survive longer. Disks of large spiral galaxies are expected to be thickened by a factor of 2 or 3 in dense environments. Disks of LSB dwarf galaxies are even more affected by tidal heating.

4 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we study the basic photometric properties of 104 dwarf galaxies situated within 10 Mpc in the field and in nearby groups. Surface photometry and the determination of mean metallicity of old stellar populations was made for the majority of the galaxies for the first time. Scaling relations found by us are in line with the model of dwarf galaxy formation as a result of supernova-driven winds. We realize, that this interpretation is rather simplistic, and should be viewed with caution.

Using our stellar and surface photometry results we obtain relations between metallicity, structural, and photometric properties of LSB dwarf galaxies. We suggest that effects theoretically predicted in the literature and observationally tested and quantified in our paper: the "metallicity – luminosity", the "scale length – luminosity", and the "surface brightness – luminosity" relations, may be the consequences of gas loss by dwarf galaxies through supernova-driven winds, which is dependent on the mass of galaxies and their environments.

The data on the luminosity and metallicity for our sample objects correspond well with the known properties of the Local Group dwarf galaxies. Apparently, the processes that govern the evolution of dwarf galaxies are similar within the LV, populated mainly by poor groups. The $Z \sim L^{0.4}$ relation for our sample objects is consistent with those predicted theoretically by Dekel & Silk (1986) for dwarf galaxies, and with the literature information on the faint end of the general relations for early-type galaxies of different masses.

The dSphs have higher apparent metallicity RGB stars as determined using the method of Lee et al. (1993) than dIrrs at a given luminosity. This fact is probably caused

by younger ages of evolved stellar populations in dIrrs in comparison with dSphs, and by environmental differences in accretion rates of pristine interstellar gas between dIrr and dSph dwarf galaxies.

The relation between the surface brightness averaged within the isophote of $25^m/\square''$ and luminosity for our sample objects, $SB_{25} \sim 0.33M_{25}$, implies the constancy of this averaged spatial luminosity density from giant to dwarf galaxies.

The central and effective SB – luminosity relations in the V and I bands, $SB_0 \sim 0.5M_L$ and $SB_e \sim 0.5M_e$, are consistent with the luminosity – radius relation, $L \sim R^4$. It was shown by Dekel & Silk (1986) that a significant gas loss in a dominant dark matter halo with upper halo circular velocity of $\sim 100 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ had to take place to reproduce this observational result.

We extend the observational scale length – luminosity relation to faint magnitudes. Galaxies fainter than $M_B \sim -13^m \div -12^m$ systematically deviate towards larger scale lengths from the dependency $h \propto L^{0.5}$, valid for bright spiral galaxies. We interpret this fact as a signature of the environmentally dependent mass-loss in small galaxies. Galaxies less massive than $10^8 M_\odot$ lose their gas efficiently through galactic winds. Tidal interactions between galaxies and the interaction with the intergalactic medium additionally influence the structure of early-type dwarfs located near the centers of groups and clusters.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Support associated with HST programs 8192, 8601, 9771, 10219, and 10235 was provided by NASA through a grant from the Space Telescope Science Institute. Data was extracted from the the SDSS Archive has been provided by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the Participating Institutions, The NASA, NSF, DOE, Japanese Monbukagakusho, and the Max Planck Society. We thank Mario Mateo for helpful comments. MES, IDK, VEK, DIM, and LNM gratefully acknowledge a partial financial support of the grants: RFBR 07-02-00005 and DFG-RFBG06-02-04017. GMK acknowledges the RFBR grant 05-02-17548.

REFERENCES

- Bell E.F., de Jong R.S., 2001, ApJ, 550, 212
- Binggeli B., Cameron L., 1993, A&AS, 98, 297
- Binggeli B., 1994, in Meylan G., Prugniel P., eds, ESO/OHP Workshop on Dwarf Galaxies, ESO Garching, p.123
- Boselli A., Gavazzi G., 2006, PASP, 118, 517
- Bruzual G., Charlot S., 2003, MNRAS, 344, 1000

Figure 11. Logarithm of the scale length versus the absolute B (from CNG) and I magnitudes integrated within the diameters D_{lim} (column 6 of Table 1). The symbols for our sample galaxies are the same as in Fig. 9. The data for disk galaxies from Vennik et al. (1996), Binggeli & Cameron (1993), and van der Kruit (1987) are shown by squares, plus-signs, and crosses (x), correspondingly. I magnitudes for disk galaxies were taken from Springob et al. (2007).

- Caldwell N., Armandroff T.E., Seitzer P., Da Costa G.S., 1992, AJ, 103, 840
- Da Costa G.S., Armandroff T.E., 1990, AJ, 100, 162
- Dalcanton J.J., Spergel D., Summers F., 1997, ApJ, 482, 659
- Davidge T.J., 2005, AJ, 130, 2087
- de Vaucouleurs G., de Vaucouleurs A., Corwin H., Jr., Buta R. J., Paturel G., & Fouqu P. 1991, Third Reference Catalogue of Bright Galaxies (New York: Springer)
- de Vaucouleurs G., 1959, Handbuch der Physik 53, 275, Flugge S. (ed.). Springer, Berlin
- Dekel A., Silk J., 1986, ApJ, 303, 39
- Dolphin A.E., Saha A., Skillman E.D., Dohm-Palmer R.C., Tolstoy E., Cole A.A., Gallagher J.S., Hoessel J.G., Mateo M., 2003, AJ, 126, 187
- Dolphin A.E. 2000, PASP, 112, 1383
- Dolphin A.E. 2000, PASP, 112, 1397
- Dressler A., 1980, ApJ, 236, 351
- Einasto J., Saar E., Kaasik A., Chernin A. D., 1974, Nature, 252, 111
- Ferrara A., Tolstoy E., 2000, MNRAS, 313, 291
- Geller M.J., Huchra J.P., 1989, Science, 246, No. 4932, 797
- Gnedin O.Y., 2003, ApJ, 589, 752
- Grebel E.K., Gallagher III J.S., Harbeck D., 2003, AJ, 125, 1926
- Grebel E.K. 1999 IAU Symp. 192, eds. P. White lock and R. Cannon ASP Conf. Ser., 17
- Gunn J.E., Gott J.R.I., 1972, ApJ, 176, 1
- Harbeck D., Grebel E.K., Holtzman J., Guhathakurta P., Brandner W., Geisler D., Sarajedini A., Dolphin A., Hurley-Keller D., Mateo M., 2001, AJ, 122, 3092
- Hidalgo-Gomez A.M., Sanchez-Salcedo F.J., Olofsson K., 2003, A&A, 399, 63
- Hogg D.W., Blanton M.R., Eisenstein D.J., et al., 2003, ApJ, 585L, 5
- Holtzman J. A., Afonso C., Dolphin A., 2006, ApJS, 166, 534
- Holtzman J. A., Burrows C. J., Casertano S., Hester J. J., Trauger J. T., Watson A. M., & Worthey G., 1995, PASP, 107, 1065
- Hubble E., Humason M.L., 1931, ApJ, 74, 43
- Hunter D., Gallagher J.S., 1985, ApJS, 58, 533
- Larson R.B., 1974, MNRAS, 169, 229
- Lee M.G., Freedmann W.L., Madire B.F., 1993, ApJ, 417, 553
- James, P. A., Shane, N. S., Knapen, J. H., Etherton, J., & Percival, S. M., 2005, A&A, 429, 851
- Johnson R.A., Lawrence A., Terlevich R., Carter D., 1997, MNRAS, 287, 333
- Jordi K., Grebel E. K., Ammon K., 2006, A&A, 460, 339
- Impey C.D., Burkholder V., Sprayberry D., 2001, AJ, 330, 634
- Impey C.D., Bothun G.D., 1997, ARA&A, 35, 267
- Karachentsev I.D., Dolphin A., Tully R. Brent, Sharina M., Makarova L., Makarov D., Sakai S., Shaya E.J., O.G. Kashibadze, Karachentseva V., Rizzi L., 2007, AJ, 133, 504
- Karachentsev I.D., Dolphin A., Tully R. Brent, Sharina M., Makarova L., Makarov D., Karachentseva V., Sakai S., Shaya E.J., 2006, AJ, 131, 1361
- Karachentsev I.D., Karachentseva V.E., Sharina M.E., 2005 in Near-field Cosmology with Dwarf Elliptical Galaxies (IAU Colloquium No. 198) H.Jerjen and B.Binggeli, eds., Cambridge Univ. Press, 105
- Karachentsev, I. D., Karachentseva, V. E., Huchtmeier, W. K., Makarov D. I., 2004 AJ, 127, 2031 (CNG)
- Karachentsev I. D., Sharina M.E., Dolphin A.E., Grebel E.K., 2003, A&A, 408, 111
- Karachentsev I. D., Grebel E.K., Sharina M.E., Dolphin A.E., Geisler D., Guhathakurta P., Hodge P.W., Karachentseva V. E., Sarajedini A., Seitzer P., 2003b, A&A, 404, 93
- Karachentsev I. D., Sharina M.E., Dolphin A.E., Grebel E.K., Geisler D., Guhathakurta P., Hodge P.W., Karachentseva V. E., Sarajedini A., Seitzer P., 2003c, A&A, 398, 467
- Karachentsev I. D., Makarov D.I., Sharina M.E., Dolphin A.E., Grebel E.K., Geisler D., Guhathakurta P., Hodge P.W., Karachentseva V. E., Sarajedini A., Seitzer P., 2003d, A&A, 398, 479
- Karachentsev I. D., Dolphin A.E., Geisler D., Grebel E.K., Guhathakurta P., Hodge P.W., Karachentseva V. E., Sarajedini A., Seitzer P., 2002a, 383, 125
- Karachentsev I. D., Sharina M.E., Dolphin A.E., Grebel E.K., Geisler D., Guhathakurta P., Hodge P.W., Karachentseva V. E., Sarajedini A., Seitzer P., 2002b, A&A, 385, 21
- Karachentsev I. D., Sharina M.E., Makarov D.I., Dolphin A.E., Grebel E.K., Geisler D., Guhathakurta P., Hodge P.W., Karachentseva V. E., Sarajedini A., Seitzer P., 2002c, A&A, 389, 812
- Karachentsev I. D., Karachentseva V. E., Dolphin A.E., Geisler D., Grebel E.K., Guhathakurta P., Hodge P.W., Sarajedini A., Seitzer P., Sharina M.E., 2001a, A&A, 363, 117
- Karachentseva V.E., Karachentsev I.D., Börngen F., 1985, A&A Suppl.Ser., 60, 213
- Kormendy J., 1985, ApJ, 295, 73
- Koposov S., Belokurov V., Evans N. W., Hewett P. C., Irwin M. J., Gilmore G., Zucker D. B., Rix H. -W., Fellhauer M., Bell E. F., Glushkova E. V., 2007, ArXiv e-prints 0706, arXiv:0706.2687
- Lee M.G., Freedman W.L., Madore B.F., 1993, ApJ, 417, 553
- Mac Low M., Ferrara A., 1999, ApJ, 513, 142
- McConnachie A.W., Peñarrubia J., Navarro J.F., 2007, MNRAS, 380, L75
- Mateo M., 1998, ARA&A, 36, 435
- Makarova L.N., 1999, A&AS, 139, 491
- Marcolini A., D'Ercole A., Brighenti F., 2006, MNRAS, 371, 643
- Mayer L., Governato F., Colpi M., Moore B., Quinn T., Wadsley J., Stadel J., Lake G., 2001, ApJ, 559, 754
- McGaugh S.S., 1994, 426, 135
- Merrit D., 1984, ApJ, 276, 26
- Moore B., Lake G., Quinn T., Stadel J., 1999, MNRAS, 304, 465
- O'Neil, K.; Bothun, G., 2000, ApJ, 529, 811
- Paturel G., Petit C., Prugniel Ph., Theureau G., Rousseau J., Brouty M., Dubois P., Cambrsy L., 2003, A&A, 412, 45
- Pilugin L.S., Ferrini F., 2000, A&A, 358, 72
- Read J.I., Pontzen A.P., Viel M., 2006, MNRAS, 371, 885
- Rejkuba M., Greggio L., Zoccali M., 2004, A&A, 415, 915
- Richer M.G., McCall M.L., 1995, ApJ, 445, 642
- Salaris M., Girardi L., 2005, MNRAS, 357, 669
- Saviane I., Held E.V., Ivanov V., Alloin D., Bresolin F., Rich R.M., Rizzi L., Momany Y., 2005 in Near-field Cosmology with Dwarf Elliptical Galaxies (IAU Colloquium No. 198) H.Jerjen and B.Binggeli, eds., Cambridge Univ. Press, 202
- Saviane I., Held E.V., Bertelli G., 2000, A&A, 355, 56
- Schlegel, D.J., Finkbeiner, D.P., Davis M., 1998, ApJ 500, 525
- Schmidt, M. 1959, ApJ, 129, 243
- Sharina M. E., Afanasiev V. L., Puzia T. H., 2006, MNRAS, 372, 1259
- Shaya E.J., Tully R.B., 1984, ApJ, 281, 56
- Sirianni M., Jee M.J., Benitez N. et al., 2005, PASP, 117, 1049

- Skillman E.D., Cote S., Miller B.W., 2003, AJ, 125, 610
 Skillman E.D., Kennicutt R.C.Jr., Hodge P., 1989 ApJ, 347, 875
 Thomas, D., Maraston, C., & Bender, R., Mendes de Oliveira C.,
 2005, ApJ, 621, 673
 Thomas, D., Bender R., Hopp U., Maraston C., Greggio L., 2003b,
 Ap&SS, 284, 599
 Tully, R. B., Rizzi, L., Dolphin A. E., Karachentsev I. D.,
 Karachentseva V. E., Makarov D. I., Makarova L., Sakai S.,
 Shaya E. J., 2006, AJ, 132, 729
 Tully, R. B., Verheijen M. A. W., Pierce M. J., Huang J.-S., Wain-
 scoat, R. J. 1996, AJ, 112, 2471
 Vader J.P., 1986, ApJ, 305, 669
 van den Bergh S., 2000, The Galaxies of the Local Group (Cam-
 bridge: Cambridge Univ. Press)
 van den Bergh S., 1999, A&ARv, 9, 273
 van der Kruit P., 1987, A&A, 173, 59
 van Zee L., Haynes M.P., Salzer J.J., 1997, AJ, 114, 2497
 Vennik J., Richter G., Thanert W., Biering C., 1996, Astron.
 Nachr., 317, 289
 White S.D.M., Rees M.J., 1978, MNRAS, 183, 341
 Worthey G., 1994, ApJS, 95, 107
 Zasov A. V., Sil'chenko I. K., 1983, AZh, 60, 1063
 Zasov A. V., Karachentseva V.E., 1979, SvAL, 5, 137

Table 1. Properties of the Local Volume dwarf galaxies. Columns contain the following data: **(1)** Galaxy Name and morphological type (second line) from CNG in numerical code according to de Vaucouleurs et al. (1991), **(2)** equatorial coordinates (J2000) from CNG, **(3)** distance modulus (first line), and Galactic extinction in V-band from Schlegel et al. (1998), **(4)** mean metallicity of the RGBs, $\sigma(V-I)$ of RGBs measured at $M_I = -3.5$ (first line) with random and systematic errors of mean metallicity of the RGBs separated by a comma (second line), **(5)** projected major axis from CNG and limiting diameter of our photometry, **(6)** apparent V and I magnitudes integrated within the diameter D_{lim} , **(7)** limiting V and I surface brightnesses (SB) taken at the distance $D_{lim}/2$ from centers of galaxies, **(8)** effective $(V-I)$ color and effective SB in the V-band (superscript "a" indicates an average color), **(9)** mean SB within the isophote of $25^m/\square''$ in the V and I bands, **(10)** apparent V and I magnitudes integrated within the isophote level $25^m/\square''$. **(11)** projected major axis radius at the isophote level $25^m/\square''$ in the V and I bands **(12)** effective radius, degree of Sersic profile, **(13)** best exponential fitting central SB in V and I bands and corresponding errors, Superscripts near the galaxy names indicate the corresponding name of the HST proposal: "1" refers to the proposals ID 9771 and 10235, "2" refers to the proposal ID 10210, and "3" refers to the proposals ID 8192 and 8601. Superscript "s" indicates, that SDSS images were used. The data listed in the columns (7)-(11), (14) were not corrected for Galactic extinction.

Name T	RA(2000) DEC(2000)	μ_0 A_v m	[Fe/H], σ_{V-I} σ [Fe/H] dex, m	Diam D_{lim} "	V_L I_L m	SBV_L $SB I_L$ $m/\square''$	$(V-I)_e$ SBV_e $m/\square''$	SBV_{25} $SB I_{25}$ $m/\square''$	V_{25} I_{25} m	$R_{V,25}$ $R_{I,25}$ "	R_e h "	SBV_C $SB I_C$ $m/\square''$
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
E349-031 ¹	00 08 13.3	27.48	-1.76,0.07	1.10	15.42	25.7	0.67	23.81	15.77	25.56	26	23.03±0.06
10	-34 34 42.0	0.04	0.03,0.14	1.28	14.71	25.0	23.81	23.35	14.80	34.13	16	22.41±0.06
E410-005 ³	00 15 31.4	26.42	-1.93	1.30	14.88	24.5	1.06				30	22.22±0.01
-1	-32 10 48.0	0.058	0.05,0.15	1.12	13.93	23.3	23.12				18	21.43±0.01
Sc22 ³	00 23 51.7	28.12		0.90	17.47	26.3	1.2	24.97	19.06	9.06	35	24.72±0.02
-3	-24 42 18.0	0.05		0.83	16.31	24.9		24.26	16.31	24.90	26	23.83±0.02
E294-010 ³	00 26 33.3	26.42	-1.48	1.10	15.29	24.4	0.91				25	22.28±0.02
-3	-41 51 20.0	0.02	0.04,0.13	0.98	14.43	23.5	23.34				15	21.50±0.03
DDO226 ³	00 43 03.8	28.46		2.20		23.7	0.84 ^a				38	22.60±0.04
10	-22 15 01.0	0.05		1.01		22.8					27	21.93±0.03
KDG2 ³	00 49 21.1	27.66	-1.75	1.20	16.12	26.0	1.28	24.24	16.35	26.19	30	23.37±0.01
-1	-18 04 28.0	0.08	0.06,0.15	1.14	15.00	24.6	24.27	23.42	15.00	34.06	18	22.46±0.01
DDO6 ³	00 49 49.3	27.62	-2.11	1.70		24.7	0.83 ^a				36	23.13±0.04
10	-21 00 58.0	0.06	0.07,0.16	0.99		23.7					23	22.45±0.04
E540-032 ³	00 50 24.3	27.67	-1.45	1.30	16.10	25.6	16.13	24.30	16.32	27.59	34	23.54±0.01
-3	-19 54 24.0	0.07	0.06,0.13	1.14	14.99	24.3	24.46	23.45	14.99	34.26	24	22.76±0.01
UGC685 ²	01 07 22.3	28.40	-1.54,0.17	1.40	13.70	25.3	0.86	23.22	13.74	48.15	24	21.37±0.01
9	16 41 02.0	0.02	0.01,0.13	1.75	12.86	24.4	22.25	22.52	12.86	52.45	15	20.66±0.01
KKH5 ³	01 07 32.5	28.15		0.60	17.05	25.7	1.61	24.16	17.70	14.04	20	23.54±0.03
10	51 26 25.0	0.94		0.83	15.72	24.3	24.53	23.49	15.72	25.00	12	22.52±0.02
KKH6 ¹	01 34 51.6	27.90	-2.38,0.13	0.80	16.27	25.8	1.26	24.08	16.47	19.81	20	23.11±0.09
10	52 05 30.0	1.16	0.04,0.18	0.86	15.05	24.4	24.04	23.08	15.05	25.94	12	22.07±0.07
KK16 ^{2,3}	01 55 20.6	28.38	-1.66,0.11	0.80	15.85	27.3	0.93	23.95	16.31	21.20	17	22.79±0.01
10	27 57 15.0	0.23	0.04,0.14	1.55	14.90	26.1	23.70	23.48	15.16	29.05	11	22.07±0.01
KK17 ^{2,3}	02 00 09.9	28.37	-1.75,0.10	0.60	16.80	27.8	1.04	24.46	17.99	11.50	18	22.82±0.01
10	28 49 57.0	0.18	0.07,0.14	1.26	15.83	26.4	24.77	23.96	16.28	20.40	11	22.98±0.01
KKH18 ³	03 03 05.9	28.23		0.70	16.17	26.2	1.12	23.69	16.35	20.62	16	22.49±0.02
10	33 41 40.0	0.66		0.99	15.13	24.8	23.37	23.10	15.13	29.68	10	21.69±0.02
NGC1311 ²	03 20 07.4	28.70	-1.33	3.20		24.0	0.78				23	20.45±0.01
9	-52 11 06.0	0.07	0.01,0.11	1.55		23.2	21.37				14	19.82±0.01
KK27 ²	03 21 05.7	28.00	-1.72,0.10	1.20	16.44	27.2	0.96	24.66	17.77	13.65	25	24.13±0.01
-3	-66 19 22.0	0.25	0.03,0.14	1.55	15.45	26.6	25.01	24.11	16.02	25.10	15	23.27±0.01
IC1959 ²	03 33 11.8	29.03	-1.80	3.00	12.77	27.6	0.80	22.85	12.89	58.70	26	20.70±0.01
9	-50 24 38.0	0.04	0.02,0.15	3.22	12.02	26.6	21.60	22.65	12.06	74.55	16	20.00±0.01
UGCA92 ¹	04 32 00.3	26.28		2.00	14.55	26.8	1.78	24.71	15.54	38.95	70	24.18±0.01
10	63 36 50.0	2.63		3.03	12.87	25.0	25.08	23.73	12.87	91.00	42	22.61±0.01
CamB ³	04 53 06.9	27.52		2.20		26.0	1.26 ^a	24.43	17.45	25.64	29	23.83±0.01
10	67 05 57.0	0.14		0.89		24.4	24.75	23.59	15.54	26.79	17	22.82±0.01
KKH34 ³	05 59 41.2	28.32		0.90	16.37	25.3	0.69	24.05	16.56	21.51	22	23.22±0.01
10	73 25 39.0	0.83		0.87	15.57	24.7	24.13	23.46	15.57	26.19	13	22.27±0.02
E121-20 ¹	06 15 54.5	28.86	-2.39	1.40	15.36	27.3	0.69	23.87	15.65	26.90	19	22.63±0.01
10	-57 43 35.0	0.13	0.05,0.18	1.55	14.65	26.5	23.57	23.53	14.78	34.10	12	22.08±0.02
E489-56 ³	06 26 17.0	28.49		0.60	15.49	25.0	0.98	23.39	15.49	26.49	17	21.94±0.02
10	-26 15 56.0	0.21		0.88	14.65	23.9	22.86				10	21.30±0.01
E490-17 ³	06 37 56.6	28.13		1.70		23.4	0.90 ^a				34	21.92±0.05
10	-25 59 59.0	0.26		0.98		22.5					20	21.07±0.03
KKH37 ¹	06 47 45.8	27.62	-1.80,0.08	1.20	15.39	28.4	0.88	23.74	15.74	24.55	17	22.40±0.01
10	80 07 26.0	0.25	0.02,0.15	1.78	14.48	27.4	23.34	23.28	14.61	33.25	10	21.50±0.01
UGC3755 ^{2,3}	07 13 51.8	29.35		1.70	13.62	25.0	0.98	22.49	13.62	58.97	25	21.27±0.02
10	10 31 19.0	0.29		1.97	12.75	24.1	21.81	21.72	12.75	58.97	15	20.58±0.02
E059-01 ¹	07 31 19.3	28.24	-1.52,0.18	2.10	13.69	25.5	0.96	23.43	14.01	49.99	48	22.72±0.05
9	-68 11 10.0	0.49	0.01,0.13	2.80	12.70	24.4	23.40	22.63	12.70	83.98	29	21.72±0.04
UGC3974 ^{2,S}	07 41 55.0	28.57		3.10		25.5	0.83	24.05	14.45	51.35	53	23.16±0.01
10	16 48 02.0	0.11		2.40		24.8	24.08	23.63	13.28	71.95	32	22.44±0.02
KK65 ^{2,3,S}	07 42 31.2	28.27		0.90	14.86	26.1	0.77	23.50	15.09	30.20	19	22.00±0.01
10	16 33 40.0	0.11		1.54	14.10	25.3	22.86	23.29	14.16	41.30	11	21.29±0.01
UGC4115 ^{S,3,2}	07 57 01.8	29.44		1.80	14.36	25.1	0.88	23.53	14.41	40.79	27	22.13±0.03
10	14 23 27.0	0.09		1.36	13.57	24.2	23.02	22.67	13.57	40.79	16	21.34±0.03
KDG52 ³	08 23 56.0	27.75	-1.90	1.30	16.67	25.8	0.95 ^a	24.78	17.23	20.62	48	24.42±0.02
10	71 01 46.0	0.07	0.09,0.15	1.06	15.72	24.7		24.10	15.72	31.67	29	23.69±0.01
DDO52 ^{S,1}	08 28 28.5	30.03		2.00	14.86	27.3	0.89	24.14	15.43	34.06	30	23.07±0.02
10	41 51 24.0	0.12		2.20	14.02	26.7	24.03	23.70	14.15	49.50	18	22.11±0.03

Table 1. Continued.

Name T	RA(2000.0) DEC(2000.)	μ_0 A_v	[Fe/H], σ_{VI} σ [Fe/H]	Diam D_{lim}	V_L I_L	SBV_L SBI_L	$(V-I)_e$ SBV_e	SBV_{25} SBI_{25}	V_{25} I_{25}	$R_{V,25}$ $R_{I,25}$	R_e h	SBV_C SBI_C
DDO53 ³	08 34 06.5	27.76	-1.93	1.60		24.6	0.63 ^a				73	23.75±0.02
10	66 10 45.0	0.12	0.06,0.15	1.00		23.7					44	23.29±0.01
D564-08 ^{S,1}	09 02 54.0	29.61		0.70	16.58	27.0	0.86	24.31	17.46	13.86	18	23.61±0.03
10	20 04 31.0	0.10		1.02	15.85	25.6	24.51	23.89	16.08	22.57	11	22.81±0.04
D634-03 ¹	09 08 53.5	29.90		0.40	17.21	26.8	0.86	24.31	18.41	9.00	15	23.82±0.01
10	14 34 55.0	0.13		0.91	16.34	26.1	24.77	23.99	16.65	18.25	9	22.83±0.01
D565-06 ^{S,1}	09 19 29.4	29.79		0.70	16.63	27.3	0.90	23.96	17.28	13.46	14	23.13±0.04
10	21 36 12.0	0.13		0.96	15.78	25.5	24.03	23.70	15.96	22.18	8	22.29±0.04
FM1 ³	09 45 10.0	27.67	-1.20	0.90	16.83	25.6	0.80	24.83	18.39	11.35	32	24.63±0.01
-3	68 45 54.0	0.26	0.05,0.11	1.00	16.06	25.5		24.17	16.19	25.50	25	23.50±0.02
KK77 ³	09 50 10.0	27.71		2.40		25.7	1.30 ^a	24.79	19.93	5.48	31	24.62±0.01
-3	67 30 24.0	0.48		0.66		24.1		23.87	16.37	19.92	18	23.55±0.01
KDG61 ^{S,3}	09 57 02.7	27.78	-1.51	2.40	14.98	27.0	1.04	24.28	16.06	28.25	48	24.00±0.06
-1	68 35 30.0	0.24	0.04,0.13	2.69	13.92	26.4	24.59	23.66	14.18	56.11	29	22.96±0.09
KKH57 ^{S,3}	10 00 16.0	27.97	-1.37	0.60	17.73	26.4	0.81	24.76	19.27	7.13	19	24.38±0.03
-3	63 11 06.0	0.08	0.03,0.12	0.74	16.90	25.4	25.31	24.29	17.49	13.46	11	23.62±0.03
ANTLIA ²	10 04 04.0	25.49	-1.81	2.00	14.70	25.3	0.60 ^a	24.45	14.92	49.05	66	23.94±0.01
10	-27 19 55.0	0.26	0.04,0.15	1.91	14.14	25.0		24.03	14.16	56.50	43	23.26±0.01
DDO71 ³	10 05 07.3	27.72	-1.17	1.70	16.46	24.8	0.98 ^a	24.13	16.46	21.41	59	23.80±0.01
-3	66 33 18.0	0.32	0.04,0.10	0.71	15.48	23.7					35	22.81±0.01
KK84 ³	10 05 34.4	29.93		1.30		25.5	1.30	23.85	16.19	22.91	19	22.72±0.02
-3	-07 44 57.0	0.16		0.88		24.0	23.62	22.78			12	21.66±0.02
KDG64 ³	10 07 01.9	27.84	-1.10	1.90		25.2	1.06 ^a	24.01	15.89	28.09	28	23.07±0.01
-3	67 49 39.0	0.18	0.04,0.11	1.00		23.9	23.98				17	22.11±0.01
HS117 ¹	10 21 25.2	27.97	-1.87,0.08	1.50	16.16	28.1	1.10	24.75	17.97	13.15	29	24.32±0.01
10	71 06 58.0	0.38	0.03,0.15	2.08	15.15	27.1	25.20	24.13	15.76	28.35	18	23.30±0.01
BK6N ³	10 34 31.9	27.93	-1.36	1.10		25.8	1.20 ^a	24.90	18.26	13.15	40	24.61±0.02
-3	66 00 42.0	0.04	0.08,0.12	0.76		24.4		23.95	16.13	22.81	28	23.55±0.02
E215-09 ¹	10 57 30.2	28.60	-1.86	2.00		26.0	1.26 ^a	24.53	15.53	36.40	60	24.04±0.01
10	-48 10 44.0	0.73	0.02,0.15	1.63		24.9		23.64	13.85	49.05	38	22.89±0.01
UGC6541 ^{S,3}	11 33 29.1	27.95	-1.57	1.40	14.03	26.0	0.46	23.22	14.17	35.07	18	21.25±0.06
10	49 14 17.0	0.06	0.05,0.15	1.51	13.54	24.9	22.59	22.68	13.54	45.39	11	20.75±0.03
NGC3741 ^{S,3}	11 36 06.4	27.41	-1.74	2.00	14.04	27.3	0.61	23.17	14.17	39.20	19	21.28±0.02
10	45 17 07.0	0.09	0.06,0.15	2.01	13.42	26.1	22.16	22.87	13.50	45.94	12	20.87±0.02
E320-14 ¹	11 37 53.4	28.76	-2.28	1.40	15.49	26.5	0.93	23.79	15.71	25.65	17	22.37±0.01
10	-39 13 14.0	0.47	0.08,0.18	1.24	14.58	25.6	23.34	23.24	14.64	32.00	10	21.52±0.01
KK109 ^{3,S}	11 47 11.2	28.27		0.60	17.77	25.9	0.71	24.26	18.32	9.56	12	23.48±0.02
10	43 40 19.0	0.06		0.60	17.06	25.2	24.41	23.80	17.30	12.65	7	22.76±0.02
DDO99 ³	11 50 53.0	27.11	-2.13	4.10		24.1	0.68 ^a				35	22.70±0.01
10	38 52 50.0	0.09	0.04,0.18	1.00		23.4					21	22.06±0.01
E379-07 ³	11 54 43.0	28.59		1.10	16.41	25.8	1.00 ^a	24.21	16.82	20.82	27	23.44±0.01
10	-33 33 29.0	0.25		1.03	15.39	24.4	24.35	23.58	15.39	30.78	17	22.70±0.01
NGC4068 ^{S,1}	12 04 02.4	28.16		3.20	12.56	24.6	0.86	23.15	12.70	82.86	45	21.72±0.03
10	52 35 19.0	0.07		3.27	11.97	25.9	22.55	22.41	11.97	98.13	27	21.06±0.02
NGC4163 ^{S,1}	12 12 08.9	27.78	-1.65	1.90	12.96	27.4	0.80	23.04	13.15	57.52	27	21.09±0.04
10	36 10 10.0	0.06	0.01,0.14	2.70	12.16	25.7	22.24	22.19	12.17	78.55	16	20.25±0.03
E321-014 ³	12 13 49.6	27.52	-2.28	1.40	16.06	23.8	0.92 ^a				33	22.80±0.02
10	-38 13 53.0	0.31	0.08,0.18	0.60	15.14	22.9					20	21.97±0.02
UGC7242 ¹	12 14 07.4	28.58	-1.49	1.90	13.87	26.4	0.98	23.03	13.92	41.00	20	21.06±0.01
10	66 05 32.0	0.06	0.02,0.13	1.64	12.97	24.9	22.04	22.50	12.97	49.25	12	20.44±0.01
DDO113 ^{S,3}	12 14 57.9	27.28	-1.99	1.50	15.41	27.0	1.01	24.64	16.42	25.74	42	24.05±0.03
10	36 13 08.0	0.07	0.05,0.16	2.14	14.39	25.5	24.93	24.11	14.61	48.71	25	23.12±0.02
UGC7298 ^{S,3}	12 16 28.6	28.12		1.10		25.7	0.76	23.63	15.87	21.38	17	22.40±0.05
10	52 13 38.0	0.08		0.86		24.7	23.28	23.28	15.15	25.74	10	22.02±0.04
UGC7369 ^{S,1}	12 19 38.7	30.52		1.00	14.22	26.6	1.07	22.71	14.34	34.62	15	21.02±0.02
10	29 52 59.0	0.06		1.51	13.14	25.3	21.92	21.75	13.17	41.96	9	19.84±0.02
DDO125 ^{S,3}	12 27 41.8	27.02	-1.73	4.30	12.51	26.4	0.93	23.54	12.69	91.87	60	22.11±0.01
10	43 29 38.0	0.07	0.02,0.15	4.24	11.66	25.1	23.03	23.18	11.66	126.3	37	21.42±0.01
UGC7605 ^{S,3}	12 28 39.0	28.23		1.10	14.46	26.4	0.56	23.49	14.66	36.04	22	21.95±0.02
10	35 43 05.0	0.05		1.76	13.88	25.6	22.83	23.20	13.95	43.96	13	21.46±0.02
E381-018 ¹	12 44 42.7	28.63	-2.06	1.20	15.28	27.7	0.66	23.36	15.55	22.90	14	21.91±0.01
10	-35 58 00.0	0.21	0.04,0.16	1.48	14.55	26.5	22.78	23.20	14.67	31.15	9	21.32±0.01
E381-20 ¹	12 46 00.4	28.69	-2.34	3.00		25.2	0.53	23.74	14.06	53.70	39	22.55±0.01
10	-33 50 17.0	0.21	0.03,0.18	2.02		24.9	23.43	23.32	13.37	60.45	23	21.87±0.01
HIPASS1247-77 ¹	12 47 32.6	29.41		0.80	17.49	27.7	1.29	24.62	18.59	8.55	13	23.93±0.02
10	-77 35 01.0	2.48		1.00	16.25	26.5	24.88	23.94	16.55	17.50	8	22.70±0.01
KK166 ^{2,3}	12 49 13.3	28.38		0.70	17.50	25.9	1.20 ^a	24.92	18.52	12.15	38	24.62±0.02
-3	35 36 45.0	0.05		0.81	16.22	24.5		23.98	16.22	24.40	26	23.51±0.02
E443-09 ¹	12 54 53.6	28.81	-2.43	0.80	16.73	27.0	0.79	24.35	17.65	12.60	20	23.71±0.01
10	-28 20 27.0	0.22	0.08,0.18	1.09	16.01	25.9	24.64	24.17	16.47	20.80	12	23.32±0.01
E269-37 ³	13 03 33.6	27.71		0.80	16.10	24.8	0.80 ^a	23.95	16.10	26.19	25	23.04±0.02
-3	-46 35 03.0	0.44		0.87	15.32	24.2		23.16	15.32	26.19	15	22.10±0.01
KK182 ¹	13 05 02.9	28.85	-2.74	1.00	15.92	27.6	0.93	23.97	16.18	22.20	15	22.67±0.02
10	-40 04 58.0	0.34	0.08,0.19	1.48	15.04	26.4	23.62	23.41	15.27	26.05	9	22.05±0.01
UGC8215 ^{1,S}	13 08 03.6	28.74	-1.67,0.11	1.00	15.61	26.4	0.62	23.75	15.86	23.10	16	22.43±0.01
10	46 49 41.0	0.04	0.03,0.14	1.18	15.00	25.9	23.36	23.40	15.12	27.60	10	21.91±0.01

Table 1. Continued.

Name T	RA (2000.0) DEC (2000.)	μ_0 A_v	[Fe/H], σ_{VI} σ [Fe/H]	Diam D_{lim}	V_L I_L	SBV_L SBI_L	$(V-I)_e$ SBV_e	SBV_{25} SBI_{25}	V_{25} I_{25}	$R_{V,25}$ $R_{I,25}$	R_e h	SBV_C SBI_C
E269-58 ¹	13 10 32.9	27.84	-1.43,0.23	3.00	12.19	25.3	1.13	22.81	12.21	82.00	36	20.70±0.03
10	-46 59 27.0	0.35	0.01,0.12	2.90	11.08	24.0	21.63	21.83	11.08	86.95	21	19.73±0.03
KK189 ¹	13 12 45.0	28.12	-1.74,0.08	0.60	16.98	25.8	1.20 ^a	24.03	17.32	17.40	20	23.82±0.04
-3	-41 49 55.0	0.38	0.04,0.14	0.81	15.78	24.5	24.19	23.30	15.95	21.23	13	22.97±0.06
E269-66 ¹	13 13 09.2	27.82	-1.22,0.19	1.40	13.74	26.2	1.06	23.81	13.94	57.95	40	22.52±0.01
-1	-44 53 24.0	0.31	0.01,0.11	2.57	12.65	25.5	23.44	23.07	12.66	74.20	24	21.38±0.01
DDO167 ^{S,3}	13 13 22.8	28.11		1.10	15.08	27.7	0.48	23.77	15.40	28.51	21	22.57±0.04
10	46 19 11.0	0.03		1.50	14.63	26.5	23.53	23.45	14.71	34.45	12	22.03±0.07
KK196 ¹	13 21 47.1	27.99	-1.96,0.10	1.30	15.47	27.0	1.09	23.94	16.02	23.15	21	22.84±0.01
10	-45 03 48.0	0.28	0.03,0.15	1.50	14.41	25.6	23.77	23.54	14.53	36.90	13	22.07±0.01
KK197 ¹	13 22 01.8	27.87	-1.19,0.24	0.90	15.31	26.1	1.27	24.15	16.50	19.69	38	23.78±0.03
-3	-42 32 08.0	0.51	0.02,0.10	1.70	14.04	24.7	24.26	23.15	14.14	45.20	23	22.55±0.03
KKs55 ¹	13 22 12.4	27.98	-1.81,0.12	0.80	15.53	27.8	1.12	25.30	16.05	71.65	50	24.88±0.01
-3	-42 43 51.0	0.48	0.04,0.15	2.39	14.40	26.4	25.74	24.30	14.91	42.55	31	23.53±0.01
KK200 ³	13 24 36.0	28.33		1.30		26.0	1.01	23.72	15.96	25.40	19	22.42±0.02
9	-30 58 20.0	0.23		1.09		24.7	23.31	23.18	14.88	32.77	11	21.70±0.01
I4247 ¹	13 26 44.4	28.48	-2.37,0.18	1.30	13.97	26.7	0.68	22.90	14.09	35.55	16	20.88±0.01
10	-30 21 45.0	0.21	0.03,0.18	1.90	13.24	26.3	21.73	22.56	13.29	42.95	10	20.13±0.02
UGC8508 ^{S,3}	13 30 44.4	27.04	-1.91	1.70	13.63	27.1	0.72	23.25	13.77	48.31	25	21.50±0.02
10	54 54 36.0	0.05	0.04,0.15	2.42	12.94	26.4	22.43	22.96	12.99	60.59	15	20.90±0.02
E444-78 ¹	13 36 30.8	28.56	-1.75,0.13	1.20	14.78	27.5	0.85	23.79	15.22	31.95	26	22.68±0.01
10	-29 14 11.0	0.18	0.02,0.14	2.51	13.89	26.9	23.56	23.44	14.10	45.75	15	21.87±0.01
E444-84 ³	13 37 20.2	28.32		1.30	14.98	24.8	0.77	23.48	14.98	35.56	31	22.40±0.02
10	-28 02 46.0	0.23		1.19	14.26	24.3	23.28	22.78	14.26	35.56	18	21.76±0.02
NGC5237 ¹	13 37 38.9	27.61		1.90	12.36	25.6	1.01	22.75	12.38	70.70	25	20.18±0.01
-3	-42 50 51.0	0.32		2.59	11.31	24.6	21.02	21.97	11.31	77.80	15	19.20±0.01
UGC8638 ^{1,S}	13 39 19.4	26.81	-1.64,0.16	1.20	13.85	26.6	0.72	23.47	14.07	44.30	29	21.98±0.01
10	24 46 33.0	0.04	0.02,0.14	2.57	13.11	25.7	22.88	23.17	13.22	59.10	17	21.33±0.01
UGC8651 ^{2,3}	13 39 53.8	27.39	-1.92, 0.11	2.30		24.6	0.64				41	22.70±0.01
10	40 44 21.0	0.02	0.02,0.15	1.57		24.1	23.62	23.08			24	22.02±0.01
I4316 ³	13 40 18.1	28.22		1.60		23.8	0.98				21	21.68±0.03
10	-28 53 40.0	0.18		0.81		22.9	22.51				12	20.98±0.02
KKs57 ¹	13 41 38.1	27.89	-1.63, 0.08	0.80	17.28	27.0	1.60	24.67	18.77	8.30	17	24.23±0.01
-3	-42 34 55.0	0.30	0.06,0.14	0.95	15.82	25.9	25.10	23.97	16.11	18.80	10	23.04±0.01
KK211 ³	13 42 05.6	27.77	-1.26	0.80	15.69	25.2	1.14	23.91	15.75	30.68	28	22.91±0.03
-5	-45 12 18.0	0.37	0.05,0.12	1.09	14.56	23.9	23.82				17	21.78±0.03
KK213 ³	13 43 35.8	27.80	-1.62	0.60	17.70	25.6	1.20 ^a	24.20	17.92	16.43	18	23.31±0.02
-3	-43 46 09.0	0.32	0.09,0.14	0.68	16.50	23.8	24.22				11	22.27±0.02
E325-11 ³	13 45 00.8	27.66	-2.18	2.70	15.73	24.2	0.96 ^a				40	23.16±0.02
10	-41 51 32.0	0.24	0.05,0.17	0.88	14.77	23.2					24	22.10±0.03
KK217 ³	13 46 17.2	27.92	-1.37	0.60	16.59	25.9	1.23	23.70	16.75	22.71	17	22.45±0.01
-3	-45 41 05.0	0.40	0.07,0.13	1.00	15.46	24.5	23.36	22.97	15.46	29.88	10	21.47±0.01
CenN ¹	13 48 09.2	27.82	-1.74,0.10	0.90	16.42	27.2	1.37	24.50	17.20	16.75	25	23.90±0.01
-3	-47 33 54.0	0.47	0.03,0.14	1.21	15.12	25.6	24.78	23.89	15.16	34.20	15	22.80±0.01
HIPASS1348-37 ¹	13 48 33.9	28.78	-2.52	0.50	17.00	25.9	0.60 ^a	24.77	18.55	10.10	33	24.53±0.01
10	-37 58 03.0	0.26	0.06,0.19	0.91	16.45	25.8		24.50	16.65	22.45	20	23.93±0.01
KK221 ³	13 48 46.4	28.00		1.50		25.5	1.30 ^a	24.82	17.51	17.83		24.67±0.02
-3	-46 59 49.0	0.46		0.88		24.2		23.64	15.46	26.39		23.40±0.02
UGC8760 ^{S,2}	13 50 51.1	28.54	-2.00,0.16	2.20	14.14	27.9	0.82	23.79	14.36	49.50	31	22.32±0.03
10	38 01 16.0	0.05	0.03,0.16	3.00	13.40	26.3	23.30	23.40	13.51	60.59	18	21.74±0.02
HIPASS1351-47 ¹	13 51 22.0	28.63		0.50	16.51	25.9	0.70 ^a	24.65	17.70	14.20	33	24.28±0.01
10	-47 00 00.0	0.48		1.03	15.83	25.4		24.26	16.15	23.85	20	23.58±0.01
KKH86 ^{S,3}	13 54 33.6	27.08	-2.33	0.70	16.55	26.7	0.91	24.15	17.11	15.44	17	23.24±0.03
10	04 14 35.0	0.09	0.11,0.18	0.82	15.86	25.7	24.17	23.75	15.91	22.57	10	22.60±0.02
UGC8833 ^{2,S}	13 54 48.7	27.52	-2.03,0.07	0.90	14.86	26.4	0.62	23.66	15.11	30.25	22	22.39±0.01
10	35 50 15.0	0.04	0.03,0.16	1.54	14.23	25.8	23.30	23.39	14.31	39.45	14	21.88±0.01
E384-016 ¹	13 57 01.6	28.26		1.30	14.37	26.7	1.00	23.37	14.65	34.00	21	21.84±0.01
10	-35 20 02.0	0.25		2.04	13.39	26.0	22.72	22.91	13.48	47.75	13	20.89±0.01
KK230 ¹	14 07 10.7	26.34	-2.02	0.60	16.31	28.2	0.58	24.44	17.25	14.95	21	23.78±0.01
10	35 03 37.0	0.05	0.09,0.16	1.73	15.68	27.4	24.70	24.19	16.25	23.10	13	23.28±0.01
UGC9128 ¹	14 15 56.5	26.75	-2.33,0.08	1.70	14.38	24.9	0.75	23.37	14.38	46.83	38	22.60±0.03
10	23 03 19.0	0.08	0.06,0.18	1.56	13.75	24.1	23.10	22.78	13.75	46.83	23	22.08±0.03
DDO190 ^{S,3}	14 24 43.5	27.23	-2.09	1.80	13.13	24.1	0.71	22.89	13.13	51.53	38	21.45±0.04
10	44 31 33.0	0.04	0.04,0.17	1.85	12.39	23.6	22.49	22.29	12.39	55.58	23	20.85±0.04
E223-09 ¹	15 01 08.5	28.95		2.60	12.83	24.2	1.00				64	22.17±0.01
10	-48 17 33.0	0.86		2.32	11.77	23.2	23.02				38	21.03±0.01
E137-18 ¹	16 20 59.3	29.01		3.20		23.5	1.33				34	20.92±0.07
9	-60 29 15.0	0.81		1.96		22.1	21.97				21	19.67±0.08
IC4662 ¹	17 47 06.3	26.90	-1.34,0.23	2.80	11.13	25.5	0.57	22.28	11.14	88.80	28	19.24±0.01
9	-64 38 25.0	0.23	0.01,0.12	3.17	10.47	24.7	20.04	21.66	10.47	95.00	17	18.74±0.01
KK246 ¹	20 03 57.4	29.78		1.20	16.50	27.4	1.37	24.21	17.37	14.15	17	23.40±0.01
10	-31 40 54.0	0.98		1.42	15.17	26.1	24.33	23.61	15.39	27.30	10	22.27±0.01
UGCA438 ³	23 26 27.5	26.59	-1.68	1.50		23.6	0.81 ^a				50	22.43±0.02
10	-32 23 26.0	0.05	0.04,0.15	0.97		22.8					30	21.79±0.03
KKH98 ³	23 45 34.0	26.95	-1.94	1.10	15.16	24.2	0.60				38	22.81±0.01
10	38 43 04.0	0.41	0.09,0.16	1.07	14.61	24.1		22.91			23	21.98±0.02

Table 2. Fundamental photometric parameters of galaxies from Table 1 measured on the SDSS images in the g and r bands. The data were transformed into B and R bands of the Johnson-Cousins system using the transformations by Jordi et al. (2006). Columns contain the following data: **(1)** Galaxy Name, **(2)** equatorial coordinates (J2000), **(3)** projected major axis from CNG and limiting diameter of our photometry, **(4)** integrated apparent B and R magnitudes, **(5)** limiting B and R surface brightnesses (SB) taken at the distance $D_{lim}/2$ from centers of galaxies, **(6)** effective $(B-R)$ color and effective SB in the R-band, **(7)** mean SB within the isophote of $25^m/\square''$ in the B and R bands, **(8)** apparent B and R magnitudes integrated within the isophote level $25^m/\square''$, **(9)** projected major axis at the isophote level $25^m/\square''$ in the B and R bands, **(10)** effective radius and model exponential scale length, **(11)** central SB in B and R bands and the corresponding errors. The data were not corrected for Galactic extinction.

Name	RA(2000) DEC(2000)	diam D_{lim}	B_L R_L	SBB_L SBR_L	$(B-R)_e$ SBR_e	SBB_{25} SBR_{25}	B_{25} R_{25}	$R_{B,25}$ $R_{R,25}$	R_e h	SBB_C SBI_C
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	10	11
UGC3974	07 41 55.0	3.10	14.61	25.35	0.77	24.24	15.06	43.56	54	23.55±0.03
	16 48 02.0	1.97	13.88	24.66	23.67	23.75	13.88	59.00	32	22.74±0.03
KK65	07 42 31.2	0.90	15.46	25.71	0.87	23.61	15.76	22.97	17	22.38±0.03
	16 33 40.0	1.10	14.64	24.86	22.42	23.27	14.64	32.87	10	21.50±0.02
UGC4115	07 57 01.8	1.80	14.84	25.48	0.84	23.83	14.99	35.64	27	22.61±0.03
	14 23 27.0	1.36	14.06	24.62	22.68	23.17	14.06	40.79	16	21.79±0.03
DDO52	08 28 28.5	2.00	15.36	27.88	0.88	24.36	16.43	23.76	31	23.63±0.03
	41 51 24.0	2.20	14.52	26.88	23.62	23.90	14.83	41.58	19	22.68±0.02
D564-08	09 02 54.0	0.70	17.16	27.47	0.97	24.66	18.97	7.92	18	24.11±0.04
	20 04 31.0	1.02	16.30	26.13	24.15	24.15	16.73	18.61	11	23.24±0.03
D565-06	09 19 29.4	0.70	17.13	27.63	0.87	24.09	18.17	9.11	14	23.62±0.05
	21 36 12.0	0.96	16.33	26.28	23.64	23.81	16.75	15.84	8	22.72±0.03
KDG61	09 57 02.7	2.40	15.66	27.69	1.18	24.83	18.94	8.25	49	24.81±0.07
	68 35 30.0	2.69	14.50	26.64	24.17	24.03	14.78	56.11	29	23.44±0.06
KKH57	10 00 16.0	0.60	18.34	27.43	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	19	24.97±0.04
	68 35 30.0	0.74	17.29	26.29	24.94	24.54	18.21	10.69	11	24.01±0.02
UGC6541	11 33 29.1	1.40	14.45	26.75	0.58	23.63	14.62	30.00	17	21.50±0.07
	49 14 17.0	1.51	13.80	25.07	22.10	22.79	13.87	38.85	10	20.92±0.03
NGC3741	11 36 06.4	2.00	14.44	27.52	0.64	23.29	14.67	32.87	19	21.66±0.04
	45 17 07.0	2.01	13.77	26.52	21.97	23.02	13.87	41.58	11	21.05±0.02
KK109	11 47 11.2	0.60	18.20	27.64	0.53	24.49	19.18	6.73	9	23.78±0.05
	43 40 19.0	0.54	17.78	26.43	24.15	24.18	18.23	9.11	5	23.26±0.06
NGC4068	12 04 02.4	3.20	13.11	25.19	0.93	23.42	13.47	68.00	44	22.09±0.03
	52 35 19.0	3.27	12.28	25.93	22.22	22.80	12.28	98.13	26	21.46±0.02
NGC4163	12 12 08.9	1.90	13.55	28.20	0.89	23.41	13.81	47.07	26	21.60±0.05
	36 10 10.0	2.70	12.63	26.42	21.67	22.55	12.67	69.52	16	20.64±0.03
DDO113	12 14 57.9	1.50	16.15	27.96	1.35	24.96	19.13	8.71	40	24.63±0.04
	36 13 08.0	2.14	14.89	26.29	24.53	24.35	15.51	34.85	24	23.64±0.02
UGC7298	12 16 28.6	1.10	16.05	26.06	0.70	23.75	16.28	19.01	16	22.60±0.05
	52 13 38.0	0.86	15.51	25.12	23.15	23.56	15.55	24.16	9	22.26±0.05
UGC7369	12 19 38.7	1.00	14.98	27.42	1.24	23.22	15.26	25.92	15	21.81±0.03
	29 52 59.0	1.51	13.72	25.99	21.38	22.26	13.76	39.68	9	20.45±0.02
DDO125	12 27 41.8	4.30	13.03	26.81	0.92	23.83	13.35	77.22	59	22.62±0.01
	43 29 38.0	4.24	12.14	25.83	22.71	23.37	12.22	108.5	35	21.79±0.01
UGC7605	12 28 39.0	1.10	14.83	26.63	0.58	23.64	15.11	31.28	21	22.25±0.03
	35 43 05.0	1.76	14.22	26.04	22.64	23.38	14.35	39.60	13	21.73±0.01
UGC8215	13 08 03.6	1.00	16.03	27.21	0.80	23.94	16.36	19.24	16	22.59±0.02
	46 49 41.0	1.06	15.39	26.14	23.18	23.68	15.48	26.68	9	22.22±0.02
DDO167	13 13 22.8	1.10	15.46	28.08	0.69	23.97	15.86	25.34	21	22.87±0.04
	46 19 11.0	1.50	14.88	26.31	23.34	23.67	15.06	32.08	13	22.41±0.05
UGC8508	13 30 44.4	1.70	14.07	27.56	0.73	23.52	14.27	43.56	25	21.93±0.03
	54 54 36.0	2.42	13.33	26.53	22.17	23.02	13.44	50.69	15	21.22±0.02
UGC8638	13 39 19.4	1.20	14.49	27.25	0.85	23.49	14.80	33.66	25	22.24±0.04
	24 46 33.0	2.35	13.61	26.36	22.44	23.29	13.75	47.92	15	21.53±0.03
UGC8760	13 50 51.1	2.20	14.58	28.68	0.85	23.96	15.00	38.81	30	22.66±0.04
	38 01 16.0	3.00	13.80	26.95	23.06	23.59	14.02	51.48	18	22.10±0.02
KKH86	13 54 33.6	0.70	17.10	27.30	1.16	24.43	17.90	12.28	17	23.63±0.04
	04 14 35.0	0.82	16.26	25.66	23.97	24.02	16.47	19.80	10	23.04±0.02
U8833	13 54 48.7	0.90	15.34	27.41	0.79	23.71	15.69	24.95	19	22.42±0.03
	35 50 15.0	1.50	14.64	26.50	22.81	23.44	14.77	33.66	11	21.88±0.03
DDO190	14 24 43.5	1.80	13.55	24.66	0.79	23.32	13.55	51.53	36	21.78±0.05
	44 31 33.0	1.85	12.77	23.96	22.26	22.68	12.77	55.58	22	21.20±0.03
SexB	10 00 00.1	5.10		24.94	0.97	23.75	12.98	78.41	64	22.60±0.10
	05 19 56.0	2.50		24.02	22.69	22.75	12.30	75.24	38	21.50±0.10

This figure "fig001.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0712.1226v2>

This figure "fig002a.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0712.1226v2>

This figure "fig002b.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0712.1226v2>

This figure "fig003.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0712.1226v2>

This figure "fig004.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0712.1226v2>

This figure "fig005.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0712.1226v2>

This figure "fig006.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0712.1226v2>

This figure "fig07.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0712.1226v2>

This figure "fig008.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0712.1226v2>

This figure "fig009a.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0712.1226v2>

This figure "fig009b.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0712.1226v2>

This figure "fig009c.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0712.1226v2>

This figure "fig0010.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0712.1226v2>

This figure "fig011a.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0712.1226v2>

This figure "fig011b.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0712.1226v2>